



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/672,132	09/27/2000	La Vaughn F. Watts JR.	M-9574 US	7083

7590

11/25/2003

DAVID L McCOMBS  
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP  
901 MAINE STREET  
SUITE 3100  
DALLAS, TX 75202-3789

EXAMINER

RAY, GOPAL C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2181

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/672,132

Applicant(s)

WATTS, LA VAUGHN F.

Examiner

Gopal C. Ray

Art Unit

2181

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 11-16 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 17-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2181

1. The examiner acknowledges the cancellation of claims 23-55 by the amendment filed on 11/10/03. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 17-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,526,493 issued to Shu.

As per claim 1, the reference of Shu teaches "detecting, by a portable computer system, a docking device class circuit present in a docking station to which the portable computer system is docked, the portable computer system and the docking station being connected by a bus therebetween" in the title, Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 1-24; and "obtaining by the portable computer system, a description of at least one device in the docking station from the docking device class circuit" in col. 3, lines 1-24.

As per claims 17-18, the claims recite apparatuses which parallel method claim 1. In teaching the construction and use of

Art Unit: 2181

the device, US Patent 5,526,493 issued to Shu teaches corresponding apparatuses.

As per claim 20, the reference of Shu teaches "the docking device class circuit operably coupled to a general purpose I/O controller" in Fig. 3, element 301.

4. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,864,708 issued to Croft et al.

As per claim 22, the reference of Croft et al. teaches "a docking device class circuit; and at least one optical connector or at least one wireless connector" in Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 7-17.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

6. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,009,486 issued to Dayan et al.

As per claim 21, the reference of Dayan et al. teaches "a docking device class circuit having a bus description table" in col. 5, lines 44-62.

Art Unit: 2181

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2-10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,526,493 issued to Shu. in view of US Patent 5,579,487 issued to Meyerson et al.

As per claims 2-10 and 19, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 with the exception of added limitation(s) to each claim. However, the reference of Meyerson et al. teaches the added limitations as follows:

As per claim 2, the reference of Meyerson et al. teaches "controlling the at least one device via commands appropriate to the bus" in col. 14, lines 59-67.

As per claim 3, the reference of Meyerson et al. inherently teaches one of the claimed buses in Fig. 11, element 200.

Art Unit: 2181

As per claim 4, the reference of Meyerson et al. teaches "controlling at least one device associated with docking" in col. 14, lines 59-67.

As per claims 5-7, the claims recite controlling and activating power supply to the docking station and portable computer. However, the reference of Meyerson et al. teaches the features in col. 15, lines 55-56.

As per claims 8-10, the reference of Meyerson et al. teaches "detecting an identifier associated with the docking device class circuit" (claim 8) in col. 2, lines 62-65, "detecting an identification number reserved for the docking device class circuit" (claim 9) in col. 2, lines 62-65 and "obtaining a list of devices under the control of the docking device class circuit" in col. 2, lines 36-51.

As per claim 19, the claim recites apparatus which parallels method claim 6. In teaching the construction and use of the device, the combination of US Patent 5,579,487 issued to Meyerson et al. and US Patent 5,526,493 issued to Shu teaches corresponding apparatus.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have realized that the above features are well known in the art as evidenced by Meyerson et al. and only

Art Unit: 2181

requires routine skill to implement. The features are desirable in any system such as applicant's for the purpose of versatility. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the above features in the system of Shu because both the systems are analogous to improving docking systems and the above features of Meyersen et al. would allow the system of Shu to efficiently use a portable computer with an associated docking station. The reference of Meyersen et al. teaches the motivation in col. 1, lines 15-20.

9. Claims 11-16 are allowable over the prior art on record. If applicant is aware of any better prior art than those are on record, he is required to bring the prior art to the attention of the examiner.

10. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/10/03 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is urged to consider the references. However, the references should be evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosure.

Art Unit: 2181

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gopal C. Ray whose telephone number is (703) 305-9647. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart, can be reached on (703) 305-4815. The fax phone numbers for this Group are (703) 746-7238 for "After-final", (703) 746-7239 "official" and (703) 746-7240 for "Non-official/Draft".

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [**mark.rinehart@uspto.gov**].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.



Serial Number: 09/672,132

Page 8

Art Unit: 2181

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to TC2100 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

*Gopal C. Ray*  
GOPAL C. RAY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2300